



AMENDED MEETING MINUTES

NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

**Wednesday, March 22, 2006
CD 1-3 Conference Rooms, Ste. 105
1st Floor One Civic Center
7447 E. Indian School Road**

PRESENT: John Shultz, Chairman (arrived at 5:41 p.m.)
Patricia Badenoch, Vice-Chair
Lisa Haskell, Commissioner
Aaron Kern, Commissioner
Jim Pompe, Commissioner

ABSENT: John Horwitz, Commissioner (excused absence)
Christine Schild, Commissioner (excused absence)

STAFF: Joanie Mead, Neighborhood Education Manager
Judy Register, C & NR General Manager

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Badenoch called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m. A roll call confirmed the presence of Commissioners as noted above.

1. Approval of February 9, 2006 Minutes.

COMMISSIONER POMPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2006 MEETING. COMMISSIONER KERN SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 4 (FOUR) TO 0 (ZERO).

2. Discussion and Possible Commission Action on Changes to the Neighborhood Enhancement Partnership (NEP) Program Guidelines and Application Process; and Discussion about Temporary Subcommittees for the Purpose of Strategic Planning and Review of NEP Guidelines.

Ms. Mead presented documents to assist the Commission with their discussion on changes to the NEP Program Guidelines and Application process.

1. Current NEP Guidelines and Application (dated August 2003).
2. Discussion topics brainstormed by the NEC in the October 5, 2005 meeting.
3. A letter from Nancy Cantor (an original NEC Commissioner) expressing her point of view on the guidelines revisions.
4. Last week's e-mail from Commissioner Schild to Mr. Keagy expressing her thoughts on Guideline inclusions.

Ms. Mead recommended that they review the documents and then go over each one section by section, discussing acceptance or changes of specific sections, and deciding what needs further review. Ms. Mead pointed out that since most are familiar with the Guidelines and Application, everyone should at least review the new material provided by those not attending the meeting. Ms. Mead promised Commissioner Kern a copy of the original Ordinance signed by Mayor Drinkwater when the Commission was established, in order to review any pertinent language.

Ms. Register suggested that following tonight's discussion, they keep track of which topics need deeper discussion by the newly formed subcommittee for review and preparation of solutions by next month's meeting. In the meantime she and staff will work on defining the responsibilities and powers of the Commission. She reminded the Commission that no Board or Commission is currently authorized to approve spending money according to the Ordinance signed by Mayor Drinkwater.

Ms. Register summarized that they are working on two tracks—1) what the NEP Guidelines will look like, and 2) what are the responsibilities of the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission.

Ms. Register pointed out that HOA v. non-HOA keeps coming up for discussion. She commented that the problem with giving priority to non-HOA neighborhoods is their lack of organization, which creates intensive staff work getting those neighborhoods interested, started, and motivated to meet deadlines. Chairman Shultz stated that most non-HOA neighborhoods want the City to do it for them, which is why they do not get involved.

Chairman Shultz elaborated that even though Glendale has one of the largest programs well established for the past ten years, it still has trouble giving Council-approved funds away to revitalize neighborhoods. The longevity of the Glendale program is a result of being resident-driven, wherein they do notification, press releases, full grant workshops, etc.

Ms. Register reported that currently there will not be any new revitalization money, since it was not included in the City Manager's proposal to City Council. The NEC funds will be the only avenue for neighborhood beautification projects.

Other Commission Comparisons:

Ms. Register suggested the NEC have one or two cycles similar to the Human Services Commission for reviewing neighborhood revitalization proposals and providing recommendations to City Council for funding. She suggested that they should allow for larger project funding in the Guidelines, and remarked that a future goal would be to receive \$250,000 worth of requests and only being able to provide \$75,000 funding, reflecting the need for increased NEC funding.

Chairman Shultz highlighted steps taken by the Glendale Commission on getting large projects funded. He discussed issues such as: Applicants doing more projects all at once rather than coming back every year; or eliminating less important portions of their project in order to finish in one year. Glendale Guidelines include right-of-way projects where HOAs match 66% (CIP)—some large projects include infrastructure, retaining walls, pool safety fences, landscaping, etc.

Chairman Shultz stated that an HOA has to show its financials and is required to come up with a 60% match. If unable to meet that requirement, the HOA must show they are in dire need and willing to do whatever it takes, including sweat equity, to complete their project. He elaborated that there were no caps and the funding comes from a general fund.

Funding Requirements—Large v. Numerous Smaller Projects:

Chairman Shultz opined he would rather see five neighborhoods submit grants. If one needed larger funding, then the Commission approves the recommendation and City Council could ask them to come back next year. Discussion followed regarding \$75,000 funding being miniscule in comparison to current project costs.

Chairman Shultz explained that when the Glendale Commission is going to give an HOA 34% of their project, and the HOA can financially prove they cannot match the 66%, then it is up to City Council to recommend scaling back the project or returning in six months to demonstrate that they are doing the right things for approval.

Ms. Register stated that adopting this procedure would take the pressure off of the Commission. City Council would have to deny them, figure it out, or decide whether the project fits under another organization's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Pompe reported that the NEC has not turned away more than 10% of their applicants because of issues with funding amounts. The problem has been either the lack of communication to the public or the actual lack of need.

Commissioner Kern recommended that they reduce restrictions on HOAs in the Guidelines, and emphasize the consideration of what would impact the neighborhood the most.

Ms. Register commented that Glendale must have decided many years ago to take a portion of their operating budget and set it aside for neighborhood enhancements.

Chairman Shultz noted that it is hard for any neighborhood to stay active on a specific project for a long period of time. He suggested that they advertise a grant of \$75,000 being available with no cap, to inspire creative ways for organizations to apply. In response to

Commissioner Kern's question about larger grant request denials deterring applicants, he pointed out that applicants could now come back every six months to apply for a grant.

Ms. Register recalled the \$2 million revitalization funds approved two years ago by City Council, noting that four neighborhoods applied because of the possibility of getting a grant of up to \$75,000. This raises the question "Are there neighborhoods willing to put forth more effort in order to get more money?" Discussion ensued regarding how NEC's current cap on funds was established.

In response to Commissioner Kern's inquiry whether a one/two year cycle would create lighter workloads for staff, Ms. Register stated that Ms. Mead would have larger spans of time to review early applicants. She noted the need to discuss what the Commission would be doing during the other months.

Vice-Chair Badenoch presented the possibility of neighborhoods saving up a contingency fund. Discussion followed regarding funds having to be used within each year, forming an improvement district, and comparisons to applying every six months—incrementally completing the project. Ms. Register stated that it might improve the value of one individual home, but not necessarily the neighborhood values.

In answer to Vice-Chair Badenoch's question as to why an improvement district cannot be formed without taxing the citizens, Chairman Shultz pointed out the State statute's rollover contingency. Discussion followed regarding neighbors not wanting the same improvements.

Commissioner Haskell inquired whether the City's list of HOA neighborhoods included organized non-HOAs. Ms. Register replied indicating HOAs that identify themselves as neighborhoods with leader(s) are added to the Neighborhood Notification Database.

Commissioner Kern presented his concerns regarding negative media resulting from one HOA receiving the whole budget. Chairman Shultz pointed out that the Commission should consult with legal counsel regarding the possibility of adding to the Guidelines: a requirement for HOA financials being supplied when applying, and possible allowances for waiving certain requirements in light of reserve studies or other information. Discussion followed regarding the City funding reserve studies to assist applicants with future grants.

Ms. Register clarified that the Commission needs to review its considerations, since these are only guidelines for use in making recommendations to City Council. In response to Commissioner Kern's concern that the Commission will become a problem if it expands beyond City Council's expectations, Chairman Shultz stated that the Commission's charter is to advise City Council, freeing up staff time for operational issues.

Ms. Register recommended that the Commission wait before deciding on what to change, noting that some Commissioners were absent, there are numerous documents to review, and staff need to obtain legal advice to prepare for next month's meeting.

Subcommittee Formation:

Ms. Mead reported that Commissioners Schild and Pompe and Vice-Chair Badenoch volunteered to form the Guidelines Research Subcommittee. Chairman Shultz invited the subcommittee to meet before next month's meeting in order to be ready with comments and suggestions.

Ms. Register stated that the Guidelines should be presented to City Council before their summer break in early July, leaving only three monthly meetings to prepare if there is no special meeting. The Commission discussed the legality of the subcommittee e-mailing members information outside of the monthly Commission meetings. Ms. Mead reported that all meetings must be posted if there is a quorum.

Ms. Mead suggested that the subcommittee prepare a packet for review at the next Commission meeting, providing it about a week in advance allowing for review time. Ms. Register discussed the recent media attention and audit, emphasizing the need to be above-board and public.

After a discussion about a time frame for the subcommittee's work, Chairman Shultz remarked that he would like the subcommittee to review everything and come up with recommendations before the April 20th meeting. The Commission will consider the recommendations and then schedule appropriate meetings, including any with City Council.

Commissioner Pompe recommended that if the Commission were to meet with City Council, they should approach Council members already interested in the NEC who were also on the Audit Subcommittee.

Commissioner Pompe reported that the subcommittee plans on meeting next week. Chairman Shultz pointed out that subcommittee meetings must be scheduled through staff. Ms. Mead stated that if the subcommittee meetings are going to be posted, the number of members of the subcommittee could be increased. Commissioner Kern expressed interest in being part of the subcommittee when needed. Ms. Mead recommended that the subcommittee meet at One Civic Center.

Ms. Mead requested that Commission members respond to any communications from staff, since she will be taking time off during April. Commissioner Pompe requested that they arrange for someone to take notes at the subcommittee meetings in order to save time. Ms. Register stated that she would ask staff if someone would be available.

3. Election of Officers (nominations to be taken from the floor).

Chairman Shultz requested Officer nominations be taken from the floor. Vice-Chair Badenoch nominated Mr. Shultz as Chairman. Chairman Shultz followed by nominating Ms. Schild as Chairman.

VICE-CHAIR BADENOCH MOTIONED TO NOMINATE JOHN SHULTZ AS CHAIRMAN. COMMISSIONER KERN SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0). CHAIRMAN SHULTZ ABSTAINED.

Commissioner Haskell nominated Ms. Badenoch as Vice-Chair with no other nominations being made.

COMMISSIONER HASKELL MOTIONED TO NOMINATE PATRICIA BADENOCH AS VICE-CHAIR. CHAIRMAN SHULTZ SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0). VICE-CHAIR BADENOCH ABSTAINED.

4. Staff and Commission Updates (A.R.S. § 38-431.02 (K)).

Ms. Mead reported an update on the NEP recap for 2006 having no changes for 2004 reimbursements, lots of 2005 recaps, and one payment for \$500 deducted for entryway signage for Sweetwater Ranch. The approximate account balance as of 3/6/6 is \$17,351. Ms. Mead stated that the financial chart is also available at the website for review.

Ms. Mead reported that State Day at the Legislature is scheduled for March 29th at 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., and anyone interested needs to contact Ms. Register immediately regarding tickets. Ms. Register stated that the event would be a great way to introduce network with citizens, the Governor, and Glendale's Enhancement Commissioners. Vice-Chair Badenoch and Commissioners Pompe and Kern agreed to attend.

5. Open Call to the Public (A.R.S. § 38-431.02)

No members of the public wished to address the Commission.

6. Next Meeting Date and Future Agenda Items

Ms. Mead requested that next month's meeting be changed because of Passover. Discussion ensued about next month's meeting being held on April 20, 2006; Commissioner Haskell stated that she was unavailable.

CHAIRMAN SHULTZ MOTIONED TO CHANGE NEXT MONTH'S MEETING FROM APRIL 13, 2006 TO APRIL 20, 2006. COMMISSIONER POMPE SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).

Commissioner Pompe requested that a review of the subcommittee's report be added to next month's agenda. Chairman Shultz clarified that Ms. Cantor's letter and Commissioner Schild's e-mail are just to initiate discussions for the Guidelines. In response to Commissioner Pompe's inquiry about whether a non-Commission member could be on the subcommittee, Chairman Shultz said that was not possible. Ms. Mead recalled that Mr. Keagy previously invited Ms. Cantor to join the subcommittee with no response.

Chairman Shultz requested that staff provide before and after photos from the past fiscal year of the Rock the House Program. Ms. Mead stated that is something they could start doing in the future, indicating that few before photos are available. Chairman Shultz commented that after photos and addresses would be a great start.

Ms. Register requested that Commissioner Kern hold his idea for Rock the House photos being displayed on the website, stating that it would be a great idea for strategic planning, to be addressed once the guidelines are completed.

Ms. Mead reported that the subdivision Hayden Estates should be ready by next month's meeting for application. Ms. Register reported that there will be a presentation from Financial Services on the spending cap and indicated that she will not be able to attend next month's meeting.

In response to Commissioner Haskell's inquiry about picnics, Ms. Mead reported that they will probably do two in the fall and two in the spring. Reporting that even though the picnic was canceled due to rain, staff still delivered bags of information to citizens.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc.

Officially approved by the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission on May 25, 2006